



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,907	06/17/2005	Paolo Agostinelli	207048	6581
7590 01/09/2006				
Abelman, Frayne & Schwab 666 Third Avenue 10Th Floor New York, NY 10017-5621		EXAMINER NGUYEN, CHAU N		
		ART UNIT 2831 PAPER NUMBER		

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/539,907	Applicant(s) AGOSTINELLI, PAOLO	
	Examiner Chau N. Nguyen	Art Unit 2831	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/17/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features of a wire consisting of a metal having the outer surface covered in a layer of alloy as claimed in claim 1, the wire passed through a flux and left to dry, pre-heated and then dipped in a bath consisting of the molten alloy as claimed in claim 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may

be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2, 3, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2, lines 1-2 and Claim 3, lines 1-2, the parenthesis should be deleted.

Claim 8 is considered vague and indefinite since it is unclear to what subject matter is being claimed.

Claim 10, line 1, "the dielectric sheath" lacks antecedent basis. In addition, since claim 1 uses the phrase "consisting of", it is improper for claim 10 to recite further element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishio (EP 481 493) in view of Shockley (2,744,063).

Nishio discloses an electric wire consisting of a metal (1) able to conductor a current, the outer surface of which is covered in a layer of alloy (2, Table 2).

Nishio does not disclose the alloy containing tin, antimony and copper. Nishio also discloses the metal wire being able to conduct a current, and the wire being a copper wire.

Shockley discloses an invention relating to an alloy containing tin, antimony and copper. Shockley discloses that alloy containing tin, antimony and copper has long been accepted as satisfactory bearing materials which can be plated on a backing metal. Alloy containing tin in amount of 95%wt, antimony in amount of 4%wt and copper in amount of 1% of Shockley has a good adherent to metal base such as copper (col. 5, lines 35-40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the alloy containing tin, antimony and copper as taught by Shockley

for the alloy layer (2) of Nishio since the alloy taught by Shockley has a good adherent to copper.

Re claims 7-9, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the modified wire of Nishio as signal wire, power wire in a winding or in a transformer since it has been held that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Re claim 10, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the modified wire of Nishio with a dielectric sheath made of woven black silk to provide the wire with an insulation layer since woven black silk is known in the art for being used as insulating material.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishio in view of Shockley as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Teshima et al. (3,027,269).

Claim 6 additionally recites the wire being passed through a flux and left dry, pre-heated and then dipped in a bath consisting of the molten alloy. Teshima et al. discloses a process for coating a metal. Teshima et al. discloses the process

comprising the steps of passing the metal through a flux and left dry, pre-heated and then dipped in a bath (col. 2). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the teaching of Teshima et al. when coating the alloy layer over the metal wire of Nishio to prevent any voids forming between the outer surface of the wire and the alloy layer.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chau N Nguyen', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831